



**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT &  
COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE**

*June 11, 2019  
Richland, WA*

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update .....	2
Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule & Cost Report.....	3
Review of Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) Chairs Letter on Community Engagement & Response from Anne White .....	6
Debrief from Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Public Meeting with Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) .....	7
Debrief from Public Budget Meeting on May 15, 2019 .....	8
History of the HAB Project Overview .....	9
Committee Business.....	10
HAB Member Self Assessments.....	11
Attachments .....	12
Attendees .....	13

*This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

## **Opening**

Jeff Burrigh, Oregon Department of Energy and Chair of the Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) Committee, welcomed committee members and introductions were made.

The April meeting minutes<sup>1</sup> were approved by consensus.

### *Announcements*

Susan Leckband, Board Chair reminded members of the upcoming Hanford Regional Dialogue (HRD) on June 12, 2019. Susan encouraged all members to attend.

Gary Garnant, HAB Issue Manager and Jeff Burrigh, PIC Chair provided book and article recommendations to PIC members.

### *Book & Article Recommendations – June 2019*

[The Hanford Advisory Board: A Case Study in Democracy, Technology and Representation](#) by Alex Sager

**Too Hot to Touch: The Problem of High-Level Nuclear Waste** by William M. Alley

## **Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Update**

Paula Call, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) provided an update of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency [Public Involvement Calendar](#) to PIC members.

Using the calendar as a guide, Paula provided an overview of upcoming public comment opportunities.

### ***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and Agency responses.*

*Q: “Do you think you will reach the 100-person limit for the Hanford Regional Dialogue?”*

R: “I think it could be greatly exceeded but it is hard to tell. The last State of the Site meeting that was held in Richland was in 2014 and there were 250 people. That was a different time. There were some Manhattan Project national historic park things breaking at that time. If it does get exceeded, we have decided not to turn anyone away. We will find a way to make it work by running duplicate breakout sessions and having overflow areas. It should be exciting. We are ready for 20 or 120 people.”

*Q: “Are you planning on having traffic controllers to help people find where they need to go?”*

R: “Yes it’s pretty structured. Our mutual goal is to not revert back to the old townhall style. We really want it to be interactive and to facilitate dialogue and shared learning.”

---

<sup>1</sup> [Public Involvement & Communications Committee, April 16, 2019 Summary](#)

*Q: “Is the look back and look ahead topic going to be two separate topics?”*

R: “It is going to be one topic called look back/look ahead. It is meant to acknowledge the cleanup progress that has been made. For the new folks coming into Hanford, they may not know there has been a lot of work done. There are some prepared talking points on that. The lookahead is meant to acknowledge the recent Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost report which shows escalating costs. It is also meant to acknowledge things that have happened recently that may change the way that cleanup is done. It is meant to address things like the Test Bed Initiative (TBI) and other ways that DOE is looking at with our regulators on how to get cleanup done that may be different than when we first started out.”

C: “Just providing some feedback on this topic and I am looking forward to seeing how it goes. It sounds more like a report than a discussion topic. I am hoping that when you frame them, you frame them with questions that engage the public to provide comments. I would not like to see just information download from the presenters.”

*Q: “How many people is the goal to have with each breakout topic?”*

R: “We looked at a typical classroom size and figured 30 is about the limit for having a quality dialogue. We are going to try to have them not swell bigger than 30.”

*Q: “Can you comment on the cancelation of the permit review for the Test Bed Initiative (TBI)?”*

R: “There is a larger discussion going on now between Department of Energy and Ecology on tank waste treatment. I am not sure if this committee has talked about the negotiations that are ongoing for tank waste treatment milestones that are in the Consent Decree. There have been some negotiations that have been going on since last fall on tank waste treatment. The Agencies have extended those negotiations several times now and they are set to expire June 14. The Agencies now need to either share the changes they will propose or if we still aren’t in agreement, we need to extend again. In light of the larger discussion around tank waste, the Department decided to withdraw the TBI permit application to be able to focus fully with Ecology on a comprehensive negotiation. TBI seemed like it was causing some distraction and concern so the Department felt it was prudent to pull it back. It has not stopped but the permit application is on pause until the two Agencies can come to an agreement on how we should move forward. That is really a better topic for Brian Vance to speak to at the HAB meeting and I am sure that he will.”

R: “To clarify, Ecology did not seek or feel it was necessary for the Test Bed Initiative permit to be cancelled. Paula is absolutely right. I am sure that both Alex and Brian will speak to this tomorrow.”

**Next Steps:** The PIC committee will continue to follow public involvement events in progress, upcoming events as well as items in the holding bin.

### **Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule & Cost Report**

Jeff Burright, PIC Chair introduced the topic of the Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report and Greg Jones, Assistant Manager for Business and Finance for DOE. In attendance with Greg from

DOE were Ben Harp, Theresa Wright, and Shannon Ortiz. Key points from Greg's presentation<sup>2</sup> include the following:

- The Hanford Lifecycle, Scope, Schedule and Cost Report identifies project work scope requiring completion on the Hanford Site for both the Richland Operations (RL) Office as well as the Office of River Protection (ORP).
- The 2019 Hanford Lifecycle, Scope, Schedule and Cost Report identifies the estimated range for total remaining cleanup cost as \$323 billion to \$677 billion dollars.
- There are a significant number of changes on the RL mission identified in the report. A large increase can be noted for Safeguards and Security. The identified increase is due to the schedule of the extended tank waste mission.
- Radioactive Liquid Tank Waste Stabilization and Disposition (PBS ORP-0014) reflected a large increase in the 2019 estimated cleanup costs. This increase reflects identified estimate uncertainties, updated overall cost range, identification of additional risks, and modification of existing risks.
- The four new discrete risks included in the 2019 Lifecycle numbers include:
  - Extension based on facility replacements
  - Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Determination
  - Spent Ion Exchange from Tank Side Cesium Removal
  - Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) Pretreatment potentially inoperable due to major black cell system failure
- The Lifecycle Report does:
  - Provide project scope, schedule and cost from 2019-2095 for DOE Hanford
  - Show the remaining estimated cleanup costs for projects
  - Include post closure long-term stewardship/institutional controls, safeguards and security, pension costs, community, and Regulator Agency support and mission support services
  - Include regulatory documentation of Site cleanup decisions
  - Include actual budget appropriated in fiscal year 2019, and future cost estimates that support compliance

- The Lifecycle Report does not:

---

<sup>2</sup> [2019 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report](#)

- Include DOE operating budget or Tribal Grants
- Identify prime contracts
- Show workforce or fulltime equivalent estimates
- In 2016, the estimate for cleanup costs were based on WTP full operations with High-Level Waste (HLW). In 2019, Consent Decree negotiated milestones were moved out several years. The moved milestones reflect an extension of the mission by 14 years.

***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and Agency responses.*

*Q: “Is this Lifecycle report available publicly?”*

R: “The Lifecycle report is available on Hanford.gov.”

*Q: “Does the Lifecycle report itself identify the assumptions made in order to make these predictions?”*

R: “It provides the scope and it provides assumed decisions as part of the assumptions. It does provide a link to System Plan 8 which has a lot of the assumptions for the ORP mission.”

*Q: “Can you talk the range of cost and potential savings from TBI? Given there is a lot of interest and discussion, I haven’t heard anything about what the full range of cost for implementation and potential savings would be.”*

R: “This is why we are doing it in three phases. In phase one, we did three gallons to prove we could dispose of it at the WCS in Texas. Phase two was to do the regulatory look at that. From a regulatory perspective, phase two was to get the NEPA documentation in place for the 2000 gallons. Phase three was to do an engineered scale. At that point, we would look at the cost of disposal and the volume generated to do a cost benefit analysis. At this point, we don’t know if it is a cost savings or not but we wanted to explore that opportunity.”

C: “Specific to that question, the National Academy study of supplemental treatment is including cost estimates that compares grouting something and either sending it to Texas or keeping it at Hanford versus glassing it. It was \$2 - \$8 billion for grout and \$20 - \$40 billion for glass. That is for the supplemental which is one half. You could extrapolate if they did that for everything.”

C: “We would like to validate that through actual disposal to see what the volume and WCS costs are going to be.”

*Q: “Do you plan to respond to comments that you received on the Lifecycle report?”*

R: “When all the comments are received, we do post them. Comments in the past we have not typically provided a formal response. We do go through them and eventually there may be a disposition of comments. I will say there was more than one letter received with extensive comments that will take awhile for us to work through. Typically, we work through them and the comments are resolved in the

next report. This time around, the next report will not be until 2022 and the report will state what we have resolved and not resolved.”

C: “The concern is that if you have these really big numbers that are providing fuel for changing direction and there are questions about those numbers, we want to make sure this is something that everyone can stand behind that we all agree.”

*Q: “The cost of running WTP seemed to jump three-fold from 2016 to 2019. I am not talking in the out years; I am talking in 2037. It went up from \$500 million to \$1.9 billion. Similarly, supplemental treatment went up from \$229 million to \$624 million in that year. I couldn’t find in the report the reason why the operating costs have gone up. I wondered if you could help. Is there anything new about operating WTP from 2016 to 2019?”*

R: “Yes, there is. When the team came out, there was just a placeholder because we didn’t know what the operating costs would be at WTP. Now that we have gotten into commissioning, we have a new estimate from Bechtel about what LAW alone will be based on commissioning costs. We re-baselined WTP recently. We got those operating costs by knowing how many commissioning techs, staffing, and cost of consumables and things like that. We have a \$450 million dollar estimate for just LAW alone. When you put pretreatment and HLW on that plus operating cost of feeding the waste, they updated the estimates to reflect that.”

**Next Steps:** An Issue Manager team was formed to address budget priorities public involvement and disclosure. The Issue Manager team consists of Gerry Pollet, Dan Solitz, Jan Catrell and Tom Galioto. The team will work to bring advice to the September Board meeting.

### **Review of Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) Chairs Letter on Community Engagement & Response from Anne White**

Jeff Burright, PIC Chair introduced the topic of the Review of EM SSAB Chairs Letter on Community Engagement and the Response from Anne White. Members had the opportunity to have an open dialogue to discuss both the letter and the response from Anne White.

Susan Leckband, Chair of the HAB provided additional context to the EM SSAB Chairs letter. With help from other Chairs, Susan drafted the letter on community engagement. A discussion was had at the September Board meeting where the Board approved by consensus for Susan to sign the letter. The letter was sent to Anne White in November of 2018. Susan noted that Anne White responded in what she felt was record time for an EM-1. As there will be a new EM-1, Susan recommended this letter be resent to whomever is identified to fill this role.

### ***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and Agency responses.*

*Q: “I think we should send the letter again and send it without changes. Would it appropriate to enclose a copy of the previous EM-1’s response?”*

R: “In my opinion that is a double-edge sword. In my opinion she is no longer in office due to political reasons. Sometimes including a letter that was signed by someone that perhaps was asked to resign is not advantageous.”

C: “I always encourage the EM SSAB to send a welcome letter to the new EM-1 as an identification to who we are.”

*Q: “She mentions in her response that she will pass this information along to the field managers and recommend they work with their teams. Do we know if that has occurred at RL?”*

R: “I know that it was passed along to Brian Vance because I asked him about it. Compared to past field managers, Brian has been much more accommodating and has shown there is a deep respect for public engagement.”

**Next Steps:** Susan will propose providing the same letter to the new EM-1 at the next EM SSAB.

**Debrief from Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Public Meeting with Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)**

Jeff Burright, PIC Chair introduced the topic of the Debrief from Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Public Meeting with Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Members who attended were encouraged to provide their perspective on the event. Rod Lobos, DOE-ORP was in attendance to answer member questions.

***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and Agency responses.*

*Q: “I heard something about potentially being a transcript of the meeting. Was there a transcriber there?”*

R: “The meeting was not recorded.”

C: “They said upfront that there would be no notes from the meeting and no transcript.”

C: “Listening in on that meeting was difficult. The audio quality was not good.”

C: “Sitting in the meeting, it was not known that folks were having issues hearing. We did take questions from folks who were on the phone.”

C: “I thought main presentations were good and I could hear all of those but when it came to questions, it was very tough to hear. There has been a practice in the past with people repeating the questions so everyone could hear what was asked. They didn’t really do that. In the future, that could be a good thing to do.”

C: “You couldn’t see it but the microphone was being held right in front of every person who asked a question. The microphone was working. It was the actual connection at some level that was the problem.”

C: “I noticed that based on microphone etiquette, some folks put it to the side. There was a little bit of that too. I think we had a couple of different technical issues that all came together to cause the problem.”

C: “I know Dana made it a point to give folks training on the microphone. Some folks are more trainable than others. We will work on that for next time.”

C: “The fact that there were no comments and nothing was recorded really brings to mind that there needs to be a public comment period again. We did not have the benefit of NRC’s review when we all commented. NRC’s questions have highlighted many things our comments included. I think it is important to reopen a public comment period.”

**Next Steps:** DOE-ORP will be providing additional presentations to the Tank Waste committee and other members of the HAB on the WIR.

### **Debrief from Public Budget Meeting on May 15, 2019**

Jeff Burright, PIC Chair introduced the topic of the Debrief from the public budget meeting on May 15, 2019. Mark Coronado and Theresa Wright from DOE were in attendance to answer questions members may have had in regards to the public budget meeting. Members who attended were encouraged to provide their perspective on the event.

#### ***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and Agency responses.*

C: “They had two microphones and one of them went out. I think overall the technical production quality was really poor.”

C: “I think we generally appreciate the public meeting and exposure to some of the data that is presented. Unfortunately, my view of this meeting was that although it is a public involvement kind of meeting, it is a budget presentation for 2021 to the public. The fact that none of the 2021 budget numbers are provided and the only budget numbers that were presented were those from 2020. It is very difficult to make comments on something that is basically a blank sheet of paper. We don’t know what we are commenting on. I was a little surprised that we heard this morning that there may be no written response to the comments that were submitted at the public meeting that were submitted. That is unfortunate because we were told at the time if you wanted your comments responded to, you needed to write them down. A number of us did that. I don’t know where those comments are. Hopefully you folks have them and can respond back to them. There were a lot of responses that were rather generated from frustration from the lack of information.”

C (Ecology): “I have been with Hanford for 19 years and I feel like a lot more detail was provided in the past. The public was able to have a lot more input and impact on the budget. It feels like it has become an exercise where there is public meeting is held and they are asked to provide priorities. Their comments are stapled to the back of the compliant level funding request and that is sent off to Headquarters. There really is no way to engage if the public values are considered in the formulation of the budget. That is what the Tri-Party Agreement says. It says that public values will be considered in the development of the budget. I also believe that DOE is not compliant with parts of the TPA that have to do with developing the budget. I am going to tell Bill Hamel that tomorrow. I think Ecology sent a letter along those lines. There does need to be more detail provided and there is not. There hasn’t been the last several years. I



think that it is a fundamental problem in taking the active role. I don't really think the public is able to provide any meaningful input the way those meetings are run. Those are my thoughts."

C: "Something that came up as part of the discussion we had earlier today was the recommendation of future public involvement activities. One of those items that was mentioned was to have a half-day meeting with the HAB in serving to input to the budget process well before the final submittal. I would appreciate to hear if you think that is possible."

R: "We will certainly consider it. I cannot commit at this point. What I have heard today is very consistent with what I heard in the budget meeting. We are actively considering your input as we look at the budget process and go through the budget cycle. I am sure will give consideration to this other proposal."

C (Ecology): "Ecology has files back to at least 2007 where we used to get contractor detailed work plans that had descriptions of work down to \$1 million dollars or less which is really fine detail compared to what we see now. The regulators used to have the ability to move priority work up or down in that detailed work plan. I think the last time we saw activity data sheet information was in 2015. It has been a couple years since we saw budget information."

R: "I know we still do the budget briefs which says what we intend to do with the President's budget when it is released. I think we are still having those meetings on a regular basis. Those meetings get delayed if the budget is delayed or we are operating under a continuing resolution. It may be in a different format than you have seen historically but we definitely have those briefings to the TPA."

*Q: "Is the President's budget pretty late in the process?"*

R: "We are always working on multiple budgets at any given time. We are talking right now about the 2021 President's budget being developed. The budget has currently been submitted to Congress. That is what we are working on. We will brief when the President's budget is released. When we get an appropriation, we will compare the two and talk about what we plan to do with the funds that have been appropriated."

**Next Steps:** The HAB will continue to follow DOE's public budget process.

### **History of the HAB Project Overview**

David Bolingbroke, PIC member introduced the topic of the History of the HAB Project Overview. David has a NEH grant through Washington State University (WSU) to work with a community on history. David will be using his skills as a historian and researcher to work on the History of the HAB project this summer. As the HAB is approaching its 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary, David will be reflecting back on how it got started. David would like to tell the story in a way that is engaging to not only the HAB but also for the public.

David shared that he sees this project to be completed digitally and placed online. David took the opportunity to walk through both Story Maps and the Scalar digital programs with the PIC.

***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and Agency responses.*

*Q: “David, are you familiar with the Hanford Cleanup, the First 25 Years that Oregon put out?”*

R: “I have seen it but haven’t read the entire thing.”

C: “You can find it online.”

C: “Looking back, I may have some of the original documents from the original charter and I would love for them to have a home. Maybe WSU could archive them.”

C: “The Hanford History Project would definitely be interested in archiving them.”

C: “There are videos of early meetings. If we could get clips, that would be great. I believe they are still in the Hanford library.”

C: “It would be great for there to be a picture collage. If you were at some kind of public venue, I think that would be interesting. If you could put a simple caption describing what it is where people could stop and look at it.”

C: “It would be interesting to see what your perspective is on what the initial goals were of the Board. This was a novel experiment.”

C: “I would love to incorporate the documents, pictures and resources you have all mentioned. We could provide links to the video clips that could be a part of the overall story.”

C: “There is a 2012 Portland State University on the Hanford Advisory Board called A Case Study in Democracy, Technology and Representation that has a lot of Hanford history. You won’t have to reinvent that wheel.”

**Next Steps:** David Bolingbroke will share a draft version of his History of the HAB project during the August PIC call.

**Committee Business**

Jeff Burright, PIC Chair introduced the topic of Committee Business. PIC committee business included the following agenda items:

*PIC 3-Month Work Plan*

Items added to work plan include:

**August**

- David Bolingbroke’s History of HAB draft project for review
- Review of potential advice joint with BCC

- TPA Public Involvement calendar status update
  - M-91
  - PUREX EECA
  - 100-BC

## September

- Review of TPA Public Involvement Plan (TBD)
- Permitting/Authorization
- June Hanford Regional Dialogue Debrief
  - Noted as Potential Advice
- Public Involvement Survey review
- David Bolingbroke's History of HAB project review

### *Debrief from EM SSAB Meeting in Georgia*

This topic was deferred to a future committee meeting.

### *Final Input for Leadership Workshop*

Members had the opportunity to discuss the upcoming leadership workshop. Members were encouraged to provide any additional input for the FY20 HAB work plan to Jeff Burright prior to the June leadership workshop.

## **HAB Member Self Assessments**

Jeff Burright, PIC Chair introduced the topic of HAB Member Self Assessments. This time was used for a round table discussion of what members have been up to. What have members done to share information about Hanford with the community and/or family and friends? Have members heard from anyone in their network that would be helpful to agencies?

- David Bolingbroke attended the May HAB tour. In addition, he is working on the Hanford History project.

- Tom Galioto received feedback from members of the public that the group needs to describe the HAB's impact on Hanford cleanup. In addition, Tom has been encouraging members to get the word out there that what you say counts.
- Ginger Wireman visited the American Association University of Women. In addition, she visited a few Kiwanis and Rotary clubs in Gig Harbor and Kingston within the last month. She also participated in the recent salmon summit. Ginger has planned back to back presentations in August.
- Gerry Pollet is planning a workshop on June 26 in Spokane to discuss DOE's re-definition of HLW. Heart of America Northwest will be supporting Columbia Riverkeeper and Yakama Nation's events this Friday. Gerry will have students working on Hanford projects attending the June Board meeting.
- Dan Solitz has shared recent dialogue about Hanford on social media.
- Gary Garnant recently updated his presentation on Hanford cleanup and went over it with the county commissioners he represents. He added a portion on the health effects from Hanford.
- Jan Catrell has had conversations with people about Hanford.
- JoLynn Garcia recently attended the EM SSAB. In addition, she has recently graduated from an executive leadership program. One thing JoLynn learned and encouraged others is to look at people, listen to people and always assume noble intent.
- Jeff Burright provided a presentation called "poisonous world" at OMSI after dark. Jeff attended to the Energy Community Alliance meeting on HLW interpretation in Washington D.C. Jeff was able to speak during the regulator panel on Oregon's perspective on the interpretation of HLW.
- Abi Zilar has been working with JoLynn on supporting the HAB.
- Ryan Miller has been working with the Agencies on the upcoming Hanford Regional Dialogue.

### **Attachments**

**Attachment 1:** Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Public Involvement Calendar

**Attachment 2:** EM SSAB Chairs Letter on Community Engagement

**Attachment 3:** Response to EM SSAB Recommendation on Community Engagement

**Attachment 4:** 2019 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report

## **Attendees**

### **Board Members and Alternates:**

Jeff Burright, Alternate	Gary Garnant, Member	Rebecca Holland, Member
Jan Catrell, Member	Susan Leckband, Member	Tom Galioto, Member
Dan Solitz, Alternate	Gerry Pollet, Member	David Bolingbroke, Member
Liz Mattson, Member (Phone)	Tom Carpenter, Alternate (Phone)	

### **Others:**

Jim Lynch, DOE-ORP (Phone)	JoLynn Garcia, DOE-ORP	Dana Gribble, MSA
Abigail Zilar, Northwind	Jennifer Colborn, MSA	Ryan Miller, Ecology
Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Paula Call, DOE	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC
Anne Knaap, Ecology	Mark Beck	Shannon Ortiz, DOE
Emy Laija, EPA (Phone)	Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian	Anne Wallenhaupt, ProSidian
Greg Jones, EPA	Ben Harp, DOE-ORP	Rod Lobos, DOE-ORP
Isaac Leggett, Ecology		